



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/615,812 07/13/00 RANEY

C 25520-B

EXAMINER

023589 QM12/0306
HOVEY WILLIAMS TIMMONS & COLLINS
2405 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY MO 64108

DEXTER, C ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-----------------------	--------------

3724
DATE MAILED:

03/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/615,812

Applicant(s)
Raney et al.

Examiner
Clark F. Dexter

Group Art Unit
3724



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 34-43 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 34-43 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 34, 35, 38, 41 and 42, drawn to a **method** of processing with a die cutting step, classified in class 83, subclass 39.
 - II. Claims 34, 36, 38 and 42, drawn to a **method** of processing with a holding and adjusting step, classified in class 83, subclass 35.
 - III. Claims 34, 37, 38, 40 and 42, drawn to a **method** of processing with a comparing step, classified in class 83, subclass 13.
 - IV. Claims 38, 39 and 43, drawn to a **method** of processing with gripping and tension-reducing steps, classified in class 83, subclass 14.
2. It is noted that some claims are common to more than one group because they contain subject matter which is common to these groups and thus are not considered to be patentably distinct from these groups (e.g., claims 34, 38 and 42 are common to groups I-III). Therefore, these common claims will be examined with the elected one of these groups.
3. Claims 34-37 have been restricted such that the patentability of the invention is presumed to lie in the details of the particular group (e.g. the specific processing step of Group I). It is noted that if claim 34 as originally filed is part of an elected group and determined to be patentable, rejoinder of claims 34-37 will be considered. Similarly, claims 38-43 have been

Art Unit: 3724

restricted such that the patentability of the invention is presumed to lie in the details of the particular group (e.g. the specific processing step of Group I). It is noted that if claim 38 as originally filed is determined to be patentable, rejoinder of claims 38-43 will be considered.

4. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Group I vs Groups II-IV

5. Inventions of groups I and II are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group I does not require the step of holding the segment to a shiftable vacuum plate of group II for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group I, and the invention of group II does not require the step of die cutting of group I for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group II.

6. Inventions of groups I and III are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group I does not require the comparing step of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group I, and the invention of group III does not require the step of die cutting of group I for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III.

7. Inventions of groups I and IV are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group I does not require the web handling steps (e.g., reducing the tension of the web) of group IV for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group I, and the

Art Unit: 3724

invention of group IV does not require the step of die cutting of group I for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group IV.

Group II vs Groups III-IV

8. Inventions of groups II and III are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group II does not require the comparing step of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group II, and the invention of group III does not require the step of holding the segment to a shiftable vacuum plate of group II for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III.

9. Inventions of groups II and IV are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group II does not require the web handling steps (e.g., reducing the tension of the web) of group IV for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group II, and the invention of group IV does not require the step of holding the segment to a shiftable vacuum plate of group II for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group IV.

Group III vs Group IV

10. Inventions of groups III and IV are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group III does not require the web handling steps (e.g., reducing the tension of the web) of group IV for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III, and the

Art Unit: 3724

invention of group IV does not require the comparing step of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group IV.

11. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

12. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at (703)308-2187.

Application/Control Number: 09/615,812

Page 6

Art Unit: 3724

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3579; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clark F. Dexter', is positioned above the printed name.

Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cf
March 5, 2001